

Amendment/Response

Reply to Office Action of August 22, 2006

REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 12, 13, 16, and 17 being amended, claims 11 and 15 being cancelled, and new claim 20 added. Support for new claim 20 is found in the specification on page 19, first new paragraph.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-6, 8-11, and 13-18 are rejected under U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,944,151 (Ménard). The claims are amended to overcome the rejection.

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 11 and 15. The examiner states in the Office Action that Ménard discloses a smart card reader-writer for storing the parameters into a smart card inserted into the smart-card reader-writer and cites the column and line numbers where the disclosure is made. Applicant has thoroughly searched the reference and is unable to find any disclosure of a smart-card reader or of parameters being stored on a smart card. In a telephone conversation with the examiner on November 15, 2006, this was brought to the examiner's attention, and the examiner agreed that Ménard did not disclose the above. These features are also not found in the other references found by the examiner, namely U.S. Patent No. 6,614,802 (Garland et al.) and U.S. Patent No. 6,205,135 (Chinni et al.).

Because Ménard does not disclose these limitations, it is respectfully suggested that the rejection of claim 1 for anticipation is overcome.

Claim 17 is amended to change "information" in the outgoing signal to "a symbol" in the outgoing signal to specify that the call is to be handled as an IP phone mode call. Support for this change is found in the specification on pages 16-17, in the paragraphs under the heading "The phone modes setting." The specification gives an example of such a symbol, i.e., the "*" found on standard telephones. Ménard does not disclose such a symbol, but rather uses a look-up table in a database to determine if the call should be processed as an IP phone mode call. These features are also not found in the other references found by the examiner, namely U.S. Patent No. 6,614,802 (Garland et al.) and U.S. Patent No. 6,205,135 (Chinni et al.).

Amendment/Response**Reply to Office Action of August 22, 2006**

Because Ménard does not disclose this limitation, it is respectfully suggested that the rejection of claim 17 for anticipation is overcome.

Dependent claims 2-6, 8-10, 13-14, and 16, being dependent on and further limiting independent claim 1, should be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional limitations they contain. Dependent claim 18, being dependent on and further limiting independent claim 17, should be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional limitations it contains. Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-6, 8-10, 13-14, and 16-18 for anticipation is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7, 12, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ménard. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claims 7 and 12, being dependent on and further limiting independent claim 1, and dependent claim 19, being dependent on and further limiting independent claim 17, should be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional limitations they contain. Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 7, 12, and 19 for obviousness is therefore respectfully requested.

New claim 20 should be allowable because it is dependent on independent claim 17, and in addition because the smart card-reader-writer is not contained in the references, as explained in the argument above with respect to anticipation.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated or by e-mail directed to Chris@PatentingServices.com.

Amendment/Response

Reply to Office Action of August 22, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher R. Pastel, Reg. No. 37,694
Attorney for Applicant(s)
PASTEL LAW FIRM
8 Perry Lane
Ithaca, New York 14850
Telephone: (607) 277-5907